

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 27 have been amended. Claims 24-32 remain in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. A petition for an extension of time is being filed concurrently herewith.

Claims 24-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Keese. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. In the Keese system, a translation of magnified portion 68 is detected and an alignment coil control signal is generated. Keese does not, however, disclose or suggest the control device of claim 24, as amended. Keese merely indicates that a deviation on an image is detected. Keese does not disclose or suggest that a predetermined signal is fed to a deflector and that the direction and amount of deflection are determined based on the signal, as in the invention of claim 24, as amended. Consequently, claim 24, as amended, should be allowable over Keese.

Please note that with the present invention it is possible to perform an accurate axis adjustment in a short period of time, because the signal that is eventually fed to the deflector is determined after determining (confirming) the operation of the deflector upon supplying a predetermined signal value. In the absence of this feature, the process of detecting a deviation on image, adjusting alignment, detecting a deviation on image, and so on, may have to be repeated over and over again, as in Keese.

Dependent claims 25 and 26 should be allowable over Keese along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Moreover, Keese does not disclose or suggest the control

device of independent claim 27, as amended. Consequently, claim 27, as amended, should be allowable over Keese.

With respect to independent claim 28, Applicants note that the portions of Keese referenced in the Office Action, namely column 5, lines 37-53 and column 8, lines 3-39, refer to a pattern recognition circuit 48. While the circuit 48 recognizes a boundary portion and calculates the amount of its translation, Keese does not disclose or suggest the step of determining the presence or absence of structural information necessary for the calculation, as recited in claim 28, and the Office Action provides no explanation to the contrary. Consequently, claim 28 should be allowable over Keese, and dependent claims 29-31 should be allowable over Keese along with claim 28 and for other reasons.

With respect to claim 32, although Keese refers to the order of adjustment and astigmatism adjustment, it does not disclose or suggest the order of an astigmatism corrector and an objective lens as recited in claim 32. Consequently, claim 32 should be allowable over Keese.

Claims 24-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Keese in view of Onoguchi. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Onoguchi does not fairly disclose or suggest the differences, discussed above, between the claimed invention and Keese. The portions of Onoguchi referenced in the Office Action, namely column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 25, merely indicate that the direction and magnitude of astigmatism are determined by comparing two images and then astigmatism is adjusted based on direction and magnitude. The direction and magnitude of astigmatism are different, however, than "the direction and amount of deflection of

said alignment deflector when a predetermined signal is supplied to said alignment deflector," as recited in claims 24 and 27.

Moreover, with respect to claims 28-31, although Onoguchi discloses that a Fourier transform is performed, it does not disclose or suggest that a Fourier transform is carried out for the determination recited in the claims. Consequently, claims 28-31 should be allowable over the art of record.

With respect to claim 32, please note that Onoguchi, like Keese, does not disclose or suggest the order of alignment of an astigmatism corrector and an objective lens, as recited in claim 32. Consequently, the rejection of claim 32 should be withdrawn.

Allowance of the application with claims 24-32 is solicited.

Dated: December 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082  
2101 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
(202) 785-9700  
Attorney for Applicant